

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claims 3 and 4 and to adopt a suggestion made by the Examiner, and claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. Claim 5 has been amended to adopt a suggestion made by the Examiner. Claim 7 has been amended to correct its dependency.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Rejoinder Issue

On page 2 of the Office Action, in paragraph 1, the Examiner indicates that Applicants' amendment to claim 11 does not make rejoinder proper.

In response, Applicants submit that the amendment to claim 11 limits the process of claim 11 to a process for the production of an electrode as claimed in claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position on rejoinder in view of the provisions of MPEP 821.04(b) upon a finding of allowable subject matter in claim 9 (see also MPEP 821.04, which indicates that in order to be eligible for rejoinder, a claim to a nonelected invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable elected claim).

Information Disclosure Statement

On page 2 of the Office Action, in paragraph 2, the Examiner indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 26, 2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37

CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because Applicant has not provided English equivalents and/or English abstracts for the foreign patents of this IDS.

In response, Applicants note that the first full paragraph on page 2 of the July 26, 2006 IDS referred to the English language version of the International Search Report as the concise explanation of the relevance of the foreign language documents. Further, Applicants note that MPEP 609.04(a)III states:

Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. This may be an explanation of which portion of the reference is particularly relevant, to which claims it applies, or merely an "X", "Y", or "A" indication on a search report.

Thus, Applicants submit that the July 26, 2006 IDS satisfied the concise explanation requirement for foreign language documents.

Nevertheless, to advance the prosecution, Applicants submit herewith an IDS with English language abstracts of the foreign language documents per the Examiner's indication.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the disclosed documents and return a fully initialed PTO/SB/08 form with the next communication from the PTO.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 4-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 4-5, the Examiner indicates that it is unclear as to what kind of “treatment” Applicant is referring in the 4th and 3rd lines of each claim, respectively. The Examiner suggests amending “treatment” to read “heating”.

Further, regarding claim 7, the 2nd line of the claim recites the limitation “the readily adhesive layer”. The Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Examiner suggests making claim 7 dependent on claim 6 and the claim will be treated as such for the purposes of this action.

In response, Applicants have adopted the suggestions made by the Examiner, and thus withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Abe et al. (JP 2002-050413, machine translation provided). Claims 1-4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. (JP 2002-050413, machine translation provided) in view of Murschall (US 20010029274). Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (US 6291763) in view of Murschall (US 20010029274). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (US 6291763) in

view of Murschall (US 20010029274) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tamai et al. (US 20020037399).

In response, Applicants submit that the laminated film of present invention is characterized by:

- (A) the transparent conductive layer having a surface tension of 40 mN/m or greater,
- (B) polyester film that has a light transmittance of no greater than 3% at a wavelength of 370 nm and a light transmittance of 70% or greater at 400 nm, and
- (C) polyester film that has absolute value of no greater than 0.8% for the difference in the heat shrinkage rates in the lengthwise direction and widthwise direction of the film upon treatment for 10 minutes at 200°C.

Abe et al and Nakamura et al disclose neither (A), (B) nor (C). And, neither Abe et al or Nakamura et al disclose an object of providing a laminated film for a dye-sensitized solar cell which has excellent adhesion between the transparent conductive layer and the porous semiconductor layer.

The transparent conductive layer without activation of the surface by plasma treatment and other things does not have a surface tension of 40 mN/n or greater (element (A)).

There are many kinds of polyester film that are not equipped with property of (B). For example, polyethyleneterephthalate film, that contains no UV absorber, is not equipped with property of (B).

And, ordinal polyester film does not show heat shrinkage rate of (C). The heat shrinkage rate of the polyester film of present invention is achieved by heat treatment that is described in specification.

The laminated film of present invention is equipped with (A), (B) and (C); accordingly, it shows excellent adhesive property between a transparent conductive layer and a porous semiconductor layer. And the solar cell that contains the laminated film of the present invention can achieve high photo-generating performance.

Consequently, present invention is not obvious over the cited art combinations, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 9, 2009